

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Double Patenting*

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1, 6-7, 10-11 and 14-15 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 and 36-42 of U.S. Patent No. 7242039. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the present application merely broaden the claims of U.S. Patent No. 7242039.

3. Claims 1, 6-7, 10-11 and 14-15 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 12 and 57-63 of copending Application No. 10/799,838. Although the conflicting claims

Art Unit: 2814

are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the present application merely broaden the claims of U.S. Application No. 10/799,838.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nishizawa (U.S. Pat. 4641167).

Nishizawa discloses a semiconductor device (cover fig.) comprising:

a drain electrode 8 (column 3, lines 5-6);

a source electrode 6 (column 3, line 5);

a channel (a region between source electrode and drain electrode) contacting the drain electrode and the source electrode, wherein the channel includes one or more of a metal oxide including zinc-germanium [a channel is doped with an impurity atom, such as: gold, mercury, zinc or the like in a germanium substrate] (cover fig., column 3, lines 13-23); and

a gate dielectric 3 (column 3, line 7) positioned between a gate electrode 7 (cover fig., column 3, line 5).

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DILINH NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-1712. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:00PM (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (571) 272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hoai v Pham/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2814

DLN